Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 and 18-29 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 7, 14, 16, 18, 20, and 22 have been amended, and claim 17 has been canceled.

Reconsideration of the application is requested for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 17-19 would be considered allowable if rewritten into independent form to recite the features of their base and intervening claims. Claim 18 has been rewritten in this manner and claim 16 has been amended to recite the features of allowable claim 17. Applicants submit that these amendments are sufficient to place claims 16, 18, and their dependent claims into condition for allowance.

Claims 1-10, 12, and 20-29 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) for being anticipated by the Julka patent publication. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to emphasize (1) the specific message indicating whether the mobile station supports a dormant function is a message different from a mobile origination message and (2) the determination of whether to conduct the dormant function is made not only based on dormant control information in the specific message but also based on service option information of the mobile station and a state of a dormant timer. These features are not disclosed by the Julka publication.

Serial No. 10/699,680 Amdt. dated July 13, 2007

terminal.

Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

The Julka publication discloses a base station controller which performs a dormant handoff based on a request message transmitted from a mobile terminal. As defined in Paragraph [0007] and [0026] to [0028], a dormant handoff is performed when the mobile terminal moves from one packet zone (e.g., cell coverage area) to another. When such movement occurs, the base station controller in the new packet zone registers the mobile

However, the Julka publication discloses that any dormant control information that the Julka mobile terminal may transmit is included in a <u>mobile origination message</u>. See Paragraph [0033]. In contrast, the claim 1 recites that the "specific message" is different from the mobile origination message, and more specifically is received "after receipt of a mobile origination message from the mobile station."

Claim 1 further recites that the base station controller determines whether to conduct the dormant function "based on service option information of the mobile station, a state of a dormant timer, and dormant control information included in the specific message received from the mobile station." The Julka publication does not disclose these features, i.e., the Julka publication discloses that a base station controller performs a dormant handoff operation in response to a mobile origination message. But, Julka does not disclose determining whether to conduct a dormant function based on service option information of the mobile station and a state of a dormant timer.

Serial No. 10/699,680 Amdt. dated July 13, 2007

Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

In fact, the Julka publication mentions nothing whatsoever about a dormant timer. More specifically, at page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Julka discloses a dormant timer based on Figures 1-3B and Paragraphs 31-35, 40, and 54. However, none of these portions in Julka disclose a dormant timer, let alone performing a dormant function based on a state of such a timer.

Because the Julka publication does not disclose all of the features of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the Julka publication does not anticipate this claim or any of its dependent claims.

Dependent claims 2-5 recite different types of specific messages, all of which are different from a mobile origination message. Because the Julka publication discloses using an origination message to initiate a dormant handoff, it is clear that the Julka publication does not disclose any of the messages recited in dependent claims 2-5, all of which are required to be different from a mobile origination message.

Dependent claim 3 further recites indicating whether a dormant function is supported by "using a field that is not used otherwise in said specific message." These features are not disclosed in the Julka publication.

Dependent claim 4 recites that "a service connect complete message" and "mobile station's state response message" are used in determining whether to perform a dormant function. These features are not disclosed in the Julka publication.

Serial No. 10/699,680

Amdt. dated July 13, 2007

Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

Dependent claim 5 recites that the specific message is a "separate notice message." These features are not disclosed in the Julka publication.

Dependent claim 6 recites additional features of how the service option information and dormant timer are used in determining whether to perform a dormant function, e.g., claim 6 recites a "selection and distribution unit (SDU) that reviews the service option information and dormant timer information received from the CCP, and if the packet data service option is indicated in the received information; prepares for determination of whether the mobile station supports the dormant function, generates a service connection message and transmits the service connection message to the mobile station, upon receiving the specific message from the mobile station and confirming the information on whether the dormant function is supported, drives the dormant timer, and upon determining whether the mobile station supports the dormant function by confirming the driving of the dormant timer in the active/connected state, conducts the dormant function." These features are not disclosed in the Julka publication.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite features similar to those which patentably distinguish claim 1 from the Julka publication, e.g., receiving information on whether a mobile station supports a dormant function in the packet data service network based on "a certain message different from a mobile origination message" transmitted between the mobile station and a base station controller, and "determining whether to conduct the dormant function based on service option information of the mobile station, a state of a dormant timer, and dormant control

Serial No. 10/699,680

Amdt. dated July 13, 2007

Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

information included in the certain message received from the mobile station." The Julka publication does not disclose these features. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 7 and its dependent claims are allowable over Julka.

Claim 20 recites receiving a message from a mobile station, said message received after receipt of a mobile origination message and including information indicating whether the mobile station supports a dormant function; and determining whether to conduct the dormant function based on service option information of the mobile station, a state of a dormant timer, and dormant control information included in the specific message received from the mobile station. The Julka publication does not disclose these features. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 20 and its dependent claims are allowable over Julka.

Claims 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of Julka. Applicants submit that claim 16 is allowable by virtue of its incorporation of the features of claim 17, and that claim 14 is allowable based on its dependency from claim 7, and for the features separately recited therein, none of which are taught or suggested by the Julka publication.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application are respectfully requested

Docket No. SI-0047

Serial No. 10/699,680 Amdt. dated July 13, 2007 Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq. Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros, Esq. Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200 Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200 (703) 766-3777 DYK:SWN:lhd:kzw

Date: July 13, 2007

\Fk4\Documents\2029\2029-044\121919.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610